

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The present application includes pending claims 1-42, all of which have been rejected. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 6-9, 12-15, 20-23, 26-29, 34-37 and 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPUB No. 20030140131, by Chandrashekhar et al. (hereinafter, "Chandrashekhar") in view of Giniger et al., US Patent No. 6,751,729 (hereinafter "Giniger"). Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 16-19, 24, 25, 30-33, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrashekhar and Giniger, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,451, issued to He et al. (hereinafter "He et al."). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least for the reasons previously set forth during prosecution and at least based on the following remarks.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

I. Chandrashekhar in view of Giniger does not make claims 1, 15 and 29 unpatentable

The Applicant first turns to the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Chandrashekhar in view of Giniger.

A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 15 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Applicant submits that Chandrashekhar, alone or in combination with Giniger, does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “hosting said communication session over a third PHY channel, said third PHY channel established between said access point and said originating access device” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

In response to the Applicant’s arguments put forward in his response of January 16, 2008, the Final Office Action essentially makes the argument that the Applicant’s claim limitation does not disclose that the same two nodes are used for each of the three disclosed PHY communication links. Final Office Action, p. 3. The Final Office Action particularly focuses on the second PHY channel. However, this argument fails to address the point made by the Applicant, namely that the communicating nodes for the *first* and the *third* PHY channels are the same. For this reason, the Examiner’s arguments put forward in the Final Office Action are addressed below in detail, in addition to the reasoning already put forward in response to the Office Action mailed on October 30, 2007 (“Office Action”).

The Examiner states in the Final Office Action that “there is no disclosure of multiple links . . . active at the same time between a pair of nodes. Applicant

states this in arguments as a limitation but this is not in the claimed invention." Final Office Action, p. 3. Initially, the Applicant does not claim that the invention is limited to concurrent communications on multiple links. Consequently, the Applicant did not argue that concurrent links are a limitation of the invention, contrary to what is claimed in the Final Office Action. The Applicant's response of January 16, 2008 does not include any argument based on concurrency of communication links. On the contrary, the Applicant hereby asserts that the first PHY channel, second PHY channel, and third PHY channel in claims 1, 15, and 29 are not limited to concurrent or time-division communications, as evidenced from the claim wording. The argument in the Final Office Action to the point of concurrent communications is thus moot.

The Final Office Action states:

There is no disclosure that the two nodes are the same two nodes. The authentication procedure between the two nodes in the claimed invention involves communications using an authentication server or a third network node (original claims 3 and 4). This particular authentication procedure does not appear to be between a pair of network nodes. The claim limitation states an access point and an originating access device. There is no disclosure that these are the same two nodes for each the three PHY communication links.

Final Office Action, p. 3. Initially, the Applicant points out that the claim limitations in claim 1 reads: "receiving on a first PHY channel of an access point, a request for initiation of a communication session from an originating device," and "hosting said communication session over a third PHY channel established between said access point and said originating access device." Thus, the first PHY channel and

the third PHY channel utilize the same communicating entities. Regarding the second PHY link, the Applicant, in claim 1, does only specify one of the communication entities, the originating access device. Therefore, the argument put forward in the Final Office Action on page 3 about whether or not the communicating entities and/or nodes are the same ones between a first PHY channel and a second PHY channel is irrelevant. While the Applicant is not conceding that the communicating entities for the first PHY channel and the second PHY channel are or are not the same, the Applicant points out that the response to the Office Action of October 30, 2007 explicitly stated that "the cited references[, Chandrashekhar in view of Giniger and He,] in the Office Action [of October 30, 2007] do not provide support for requesting a communication session on a **first PHY channel**, and hosting said communication session on a **third PHY channel, wherein both communication links are between an access point and an originating device**, as claimed by the Applicant." Thus, the argument regarding the second PHY channel put forth in the Final Office Action, is missing the point, and is not providing any further support that may indicate that Chandrashekhar may anticipate Claim 1, 15, or 29. The Applicant therefore believes to have overcome the 103(a) rejections, and respectfully requests claim 1 to be made allowable.

Furthermore, the Office Action of October 30, 2007 reads:

[T]he specification states that, 'A communication session may be

hosted over the first PHY channel, the second PHY channel or a third PHY channel.' . . . There is no disclosure that a communication session is hosted over the third PHY channels exclusively. If applicant feels there is disclosure for this particular claims limitation, please feel [free] to indicate the required citations for confirmations. *Office Action, Section 3.1.*

The Applicant points out that interpreting the claims in light of the specification does not require that everything expressed in the specification must be read into all the claims. *Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*, 724 F.2d 951, 957 (C.A. Fed. 1983). If everything in the specification were required to be read into the claims, there would be no need for claims. *SRI Intern. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of America*, 775 F.2d 1107, 1121 (C.A. Fed. 1985). Since the Applicant's claim limitation of "hosting said communication session over a third PHY channel" is explicitly stated in the specification, the Applicant respectfully requests the objection to the wording of the claim limitation to be withdrawn.

Further, with respect to the above claim limitation, the Office Action of October 30, 2007 states that a physical communications path is a requirement to host a communications session. Also, the Office Action of October 30, 2007 states that "[t]he Chandrashekhar prior art discloses multiple communications paths available for access to the authentication server, to host a communications session, and for the secure transfer of security information (encryption/decryption keys)." The Office Action in Section 3.3, and the Final Office Action in Section 5, refer for support to Chandrashekhar, paragraph [0040], lines 4-11. Paragraph

[0040] of Chandrashekhar does specify multiple links as specified by the Applicant in claims 1, 15, and 29. Specifically, paragraph [0040] of Chandrashekhar does not specify multiple links between a pair of nodes. Instead, Chandrashekhar specifies a number of links, each of which connects a different pair of communicating nodes.

More specifically, Chandrashekhar, at paragraph [0040], lines 4-11, states:

Similarly, a dial-in user 37A and wireless user 38A communicate with the low speed access network 30A via respective communications links. The low speed access network 30A communicates with a high speed core network 10 via an IP services aggregation switch 320A. The high speed core network 10 communicates with the Internet 20 via a router 15A, and with a data center or ISP NOC via a router 15B.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that this is different from the Applicants claim, as can be seen readily by reading claims 1, 15, or 29 in their entirety. For example, the Applicant's claim 1 states, "receiving on a first PHY channel of an access point, a request for initiation of a communication session from an originating access device; authenticating said communication session by authenticating said originating access device using a second PHY channel; and hosting said communication session over a third PHY channel, said third PHY channel established between said access point and said originating access device." Similar recitations are in the Applicant's claims 15 and 29.

The Office Action of October 30th, in Section 5, further refers to Chandrashekhar paragraph [0054], lines 3-5, lines 10-12; paragraph [0108], lines 1-5; paragraph [0056], lines 1-3; paragraph [0048], lines 1-7; and Chandrashekhar FIG. 3. None of these references, suggest, teach or motivate at least "receiving

on a **first PHY channel** of an access point, a request for initiation of a **communication session** from an originating access device” and “hosting **said communication session** over a **third PHY channel**, said third PHY channel established between said access point and said originating access device.” Specifically, the cited references in the Office action do not provide support for requesting a communication session on a first PHY channel, and hosting said communication session on a third PHY channel, wherein both communication links are between an access point and an originating device, as claimed by the Applicant. The Applicant hence asserts that claims 1, 15 and 29 constitute patentable subject matter.

The Applicant submits that Chandrashekhar, alone or in combination with Giniger, does not disclose the independent claims 1, 15, and 29, and respectfully requests that the restriction be withdrawn.

Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 1, 15, and 29.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 6-9, 12-14, 20-23, 26-28, 34-37 and 40-42

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 15 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Chandrashekhar in view of Giniger has been overcome and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 6-9, 12-14, 20-23, 26-28, 34-37 and 40-42 depend from independent claims 1, 15 and 29, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 6-9, 12-14, 20-23, 26-28, 34-37 and 40-42.

II. The Proposed Combination of Chandrashekhar, Giniger, and He et al. Does Not Render Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 16-19, 24, 25, 30-33, 38 and 39 Unpatentable

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 2-5, 10, 11, 16-19, 24, 25, 30-33, 38 and 39 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chandrashekhar and Giniger in view of He et al. The Applicant notes that the proposed combination of Chandrashekhar, Giniger, and He et al. forms the basis for all of the pending rejections.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 15 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103a as being unpatentable over Chandrashekhar in view of Giniger has been overcome. Since claims 2-5, 10, 11, 16-19, 24, 25, 30-33, 38 and 39 are dependant on independent claims 1, 15, and 29, respectively, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of the dependent claims consequently be withdrawn and the claims 2-5, 10, 11, 16-19,

Application No. 10/658,310
Reply to Final Office Action of May 2, 2008

24, 25, 30-33, 38 and 39 to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview, and request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney at (312) 775-8105.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2008

/Ognyan Beremski/

Ognyan Beremski, Esq.
Registration No. 51,458
Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 WEST MADISON STREET, 34TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60661
(312) 775-8105

/CZF